

(Not) Summing over Kaluza-Kleins

Johannes Hirn^{1,*} and Verónica Sanz^{2,†}

¹*Department of Physics, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520*

²*Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215*

Abstract

Models in extra-dimensions have unique features. Many of their surprising properties simply result from the underlying 5D structure. This structure shows up as “Sum Rules” involving the whole tower of Kaluza-Kleins. In this paper, we present a holographic *shortcut* and derive these results without solving the eigenvalue problem: we express 4D physical quantities directly in terms of the 5D metric. In warped space, one can go further and isolate the effect of the new physics sector. This method can be used for any 5D model, and we apply it here to the case of holographic QCD and technicolor.

*Electronic address: johannes.hirn@yale.edu

†Electronic address: vsanz@bu.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

We are interested in physical predictions of 5D models. These are often derived using the Kaluza-Klein (KK) decomposition. The heavy KKs can be integrated out, and one obtains the effective theory valid at low energies. Physical quantities in this effective theory involve contributions from *all* modes. Such relations expressing 4D observables as a sum over KKs are called *Sum Rules* (SRs). Computing these SRs is in general difficult: it involves solving the eigenvalue problem for a –large– number of states.

Here we present a method to bypass this problem. One can obtain each 4D physical quantity from a single geometrical computation in 5D, illustrating an application of holography. In practice, this is possible because KKs are excitations of a single 5D field, and thus obey properties of orthogonality and completeness. Using these properties, one transforms the SRs into geometrical factors.

This method has clear advantages besides computational economy: 1) computations can be carried out for all metrics, not just flat space or AdS, 2) relations among 4D observables (which depend on the 5D structure of the model) show up with no need of specifying the metric, and finally 3) one can obtain approximate expressions for classes of metrics. Since physically successful geometries seem to require something beyond flat space or even pure AdS, point 1) above turns out to be particularly useful.

In the present article, we describe a wide range of new applications, in order to demonstrate the generality and the power of the method. We focus on the 5D case as opposed to the deconstructed one, in order to work with differential equations rather than matrices. The results would go through for moose models. To our knowledge, the first SRs were derived in deconstructed models in connection with the Weinberg SRs of QCD [1] and in 5D models in connection with the high-energy behavior of longitudinal WW scattering [2]¹. Other applications to deconstruction can be found in [5, 6, 7, 8], and to extra-dimensional models in [9, 10, 11, 12].

In Section 2, we demonstrate the technique in a simple case: the boundary conditions (BCs) select from the 5D field only massive spin-1 fields. From this, the reader should be able to apply the method to other situations. In Section 3, we collect and comment some

¹ See also [3, 4].

results that can be obtained. We then turn to electroweak applications by coupling the model to $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge fields in Section 4. We illustrate the role played by the warp factor, and use our method to construct an expansion for the masses. In Section 5, we apply our methods to the ρ and T parameters. We conclude in Section 6.

II. WHAT ARE SUM RULES GOOD FOR?

To give a flavor of the way things work, we derive SRs in a simple setting. Physical applications will follow in the next Sections. The method can be summarized as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{4D quantities} &= \sum_{\text{KKs}} \text{KK properties} \\ &= \text{Geometrical factor.} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The extra dimension considered here is an interval. The two ends of the space are located at $z = l_0$ (the *UV brane*) and $z = l_1$ (the *IR brane*). We define the metric as follows

$$ds^2 = w(z)^2 (\eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu - dz^2), \tag{2}$$

where $w(z)$ is the *warp factor*. The *geometrical factors* of (1) are multiple integrals of $w(z)$ *only*, and can thus be computed directly once the metric is specified.

For example $w(z) = 1, l_0/z$ represent flat space and AdS [13] respectively. *Gap metrics* are metrics whose w grows in the UV as least as fast as AdS [11]. For applications to electroweak symmetry breaking (EWSB), this growth induces a gap between the light sector (γ, Z, W) and the KKs. We will see the importance of gap metrics in Section IV.

For this Section and the next, we consider fields with $(-)$ UV BCs. Only starting from Section 4 will we consider other UV BCs.

A. An example: KK masses

Let us give a first example of a SR. To compute some physical observables we need to obtain the effect of KK exchange. This exchange is suppressed by the KK masses, and we want to compute the following sum

$$\Sigma \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{M_n^2} = ? \tag{3}$$

Such a sum can be calculated for very simple metrics only. In flat space, considering only the first KK in the sum (3) would provide an approximation good at the 20% level. For AdS, the sum is still dominated by the first resonance, although the error is this time of 30%.

Apart from exceptional cases, one cannot obtain an analytic expression for the spectrum. Moreover, in such cases, a large number of KKs can give sizeable contributions to the sum. Should we solve numerically for a large number of eigenmodes? The answer is no, since we can obtain the geometrical factor in the right-hand side of the SR (3) in 3 steps :

Step 1.) Use the normalization of the wave-functions to write

$$\sum_n \frac{1}{M_n^2} = \frac{2}{g_5^2} \sum_n \frac{\int w \varphi_n^2}{M_n^2}. \quad (4)$$

Note the shorthand notation of Appendix A, very useful throughout the paper. The aim is then to get rid of the $1/M_n^2$ factor in order to apply the completeness relation.

Step 2.) This is achieved by integrating twice the equation of motion (EOM), which we write as

$$\frac{1}{M_n^2} \partial (w \partial \varphi_n) = -w \varphi_n. \quad (5)$$

To integrate this, attention must be paid to the BCs. Sticking for the moment to the simplest case of $(-, +)$ BCs, integration of the EOMs (5) leads to

$$\frac{\varphi_n(z)}{M_n^2} = \int_{z'}^z \frac{1}{w} \int_{z'} w \varphi_n. \quad (6)$$

Step 3.) We can then plug the expression (6) into the sum (4), and use the completeness relation ²

$$\frac{2}{g_5^2} w(z) \sum_n \varphi_n(z) \varphi_n(z') = \delta(z - z'). \quad (7)$$

For $(+)$ IR BCs one obtains for the SR (3)

$$\Sigma_+ \equiv \sum_n \frac{1}{M_{+,n}^2} = \int w \int^z \frac{1}{w}. \quad \mathbf{SR1} \quad (8)$$

For fields with $(-)$ IR BCs, the result would be

$$\Sigma_- = \sum_n \frac{1}{M_{-,n}^2} = \int w \alpha_- \int^z \frac{1}{w}, \quad \mathbf{SR1'} \quad (9)$$

² This distribution is to be applied to a function satisfying the same BCs as φ .

where α_- is itself a function of w

$$\alpha_-(z) = \frac{\int_z \frac{1}{w}}{\int \frac{1}{w}}. \quad (10)$$

Σ_+ and Σ_- are derived assuming $(-)$ UV BCs. We can read off the SR for $(+)$ UV BCs by just swapping l_0 and l_1 . A field satisfying $(+, -)$ BCs follows the SR

$$\Sigma_+^s = \Sigma_+(l_0 \leftrightarrow l_1). \quad \mathbf{SR1''} \quad (11)$$

Finally, the SR for a $(+, +)$ field is divergent, signaling the presence of a massless mode.

This method can also be applied to mixed BCs, see Appendix B for details. Keep also in mind that the expressions (8-11) are valid for gauge bosons. For other spins, the derivation can be performed along the same lines.

B. KK exchange

Consider now a more physical quantity: the contribution of KK exchange to some process. Assume the KKs are coupled to some other fields (fermion bilinears with profile f) via the overlap integral

$$g_n = \int \frac{dz}{g_5^2} w(z) f(z) \varphi_n(z), \quad (12)$$

for the example of spin-1 KKs with $(+)$ IR BCs. The contribution of KK exchange to 4-fermion interactions can then be expressed as

$$\sum_n \frac{g_n^2}{M_n^2} = \frac{1}{2g_5^2} \int w f \int^z \frac{1}{w} \int_{z'} w f. \quad (13)$$

This is done again by using first the implicit expression for φ/M^2 (6) in terms of a double integral and then applying completeness relation (7).

If the fermions are localized at a particular point in the fifth dimension, z_* , one obtains

$$\sum_n \frac{\varphi_n(z_*)^2}{M_n^2} = \frac{g_5^2}{2} \int^{z_*} \frac{1}{w}. \quad \mathbf{SR2} \quad (14)$$

Note also that there may be situations in which the infinite sums **SR1** and **SR1'** (3) do not converge. For example, in the setting of [14], masses follow Regge trajectories $M_n^2 \sim n$ and **SR1** diverges. On the other hand the physical quantity (13) is finite since $f(+\infty) = 0$, and so is the SR (14).

III. THE CASE OF HOLOGRAPHIC QCD

Let us describe some SRs and their meaning in a simple example, Holographic QCD. The bulk gauge symmetry is the QCD chiral symmetry, $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$, with a common 5D coupling g_5 .

Chiral symmetry is broken spontaneously, leading to massless pions at low energies. The spontaneous breaking has a clear interpretation in an AdS background. Breaking of chiral symmetry by the vev of an operator (condensate) of dimension d is done by introducing a bifundamental, $X(z)$, whose vev is the order parameter for chiral symmetry breaking [15, 16]

$$\langle X \rangle = \sigma z^d. \quad (15)$$

The value of d is set by the X bulk mass: $m^2/l_0^2 = d(d-4)$ ³.

At the quadratic level, X only couples to the axial combination of the LR bulk fields. This effect can be recast as an *effective* metric for the axial field [18], as well as a modification of the IR BC. The effect of these modified BCs is explained in Appendix B. Therefore, whereas the vector field only *sees* the AdS background,

$$w_V(z) = \frac{l_0}{z}, \quad (16)$$

the axial sees a different metric

$$w_A(z) = \frac{l_0}{z} f(z). \quad (17)$$

The particular form of $f(z)$ depends on the dimension of the operator. We gave details on how to compute its form in [18].

Other background fields can also act on vector and axial fields without breaking chiral symmetry. In that case, $w_V(z) \neq l_0/z$. For the present paper, one only needs to take into account that in general the *effective* metrics of vector and axial are different

$$w_V \neq w_A. \quad (18)$$

The key point here is that the coupling of A or V to background fields can be recast as an effective metric and different BCs. And that is all you need to extract SRs.

³ For a review on the AdS/CFT correspondence, see for example [17] and references therein.

Within this setup, one can obtain many SRs involving resonance couplings (g_n, f_n, α_n) and the low energy constants (L_i 's) of the chiral Lagrangian ⁴. Let us enumerate some of them,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_{V_n} g_{V_n} M_{V_n}^2 = f_{\pi}^2 = \frac{1}{g_5^2 \int \frac{1}{w_A}}, \quad \mathbf{SR3} \quad (19)$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_{V_n} g_{V_n} = 2L_9 = \frac{1}{2g_5^2} \int w_V (1 - \alpha_A^2), \quad \mathbf{SR4} \quad (20)$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_{V_n}^2 = 8L_1 = \frac{1}{4g_5^2} \int w_V (1 - \alpha_A^2)^2, \quad \mathbf{SR5} \quad (21)$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_{A_n} (f_{A_n} + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_{A_n}) = 4(L_9 + L_{10}) = \frac{1}{g_5^2} \int \alpha_A^2 (w_A - w_V), \quad \mathbf{SR6} \quad (22)$$

What is the physical importance of these SRs? All them ensure the *high-energy softness* of some physical process. This behavior has been experimentally tested and/or is expected from theoretical grounds. In resonance models, these relations have to be imposed by hand. In a 5D model it comes automatically from the non-locality in the 5th dimension and the 5D gauge invariance.

SR3 and **SR4** ensure high-energy softness of the vector form factor. **SR5** protects the elastic Goldstone boson scattering from violating the Froissart bound. **SR6** is essential for the soft high energy behavior of the axial form factor. Summarizing, physical amplitudes are determined by the following SRs

High Energy Softness

$$\text{Unitarity, GB scattering} \implies \mathbf{SR5},$$

$$\text{Vector Form Factor} \implies \mathbf{SR3, SR4},$$

$$\text{Axial Form Factor} \implies \mathbf{SR6},$$

Two comments are in order:

1. These SRs and consequently, the correct behavior of some amplitudes at high energy, are satisfied *whatever the form of the effective metrics w_A and w_V .*

⁴ See [9] for definitions. One can also extract SRs involving the $\mathcal{O}(p^6)$ Lagrangian along the lines of Section II B.

2. It is impossible to verify these relations by *summing over a finite number of KKs*.

This gives a very clear example of how (not) summing over KKs is useful to get physical quantities.

Another interesting SR is the one for the S -parameter,

$$\begin{aligned} S &= 4\pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (f_{V_n}^2 - f_{A_n}^2) \\ &= \frac{4\pi}{g_5^2} \int w_V - w_A \alpha_A^2. \end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{SR7} \tag{23}$$

The detailed derivation of this SR is done in [18]. We used the same simple techniques of Section II A to obtain **SR7**.

Why is it important that the SRs are satisfied *whatever the form of the metric*? Effective metrics leading to interesting phenomenology for electroweak symmetry breaking are not simply flat or AdS. Gauge fields couple to background fields as in (15), representing electroweak symmetry breaking or dilaton couplings. Using our method [18], one can rewrite these fields as effective metrics (17). The resulting metric is no longer AdS, but a more complicated function. **SR7** is a compact and exact relation between the S parameter and the effective metric, whatever its form.

Another advantage of **SR7** is that computing partial sums over the first $f_{V,A}$'s in (23) would give an incorrect answer. For non-flat or AdS metrics, the sum in (23) is not saturated by the first resonance. One should then sum over a number of KKs (still below the IR cutoff) to obtain a good approximation for S . **SR7** bypasses this problem by giving at once the exact answer.

IV. THE MANY VIRTUES OF GAP METRICS

In this section we describe the importance of working with gap metrics to turn a QCD-like model into a description of EWSB.

A. The meaning of the UV brane: the holographic recipe

We have described how the bulk gauge symmetry is broken near the IR. To solve the second-order EOMs, one must specify a second set of BCs: those on the UV brane.

To select these BCs, one evaluates the action on the solution, by plugging in the EOMs. For a Yang-Mills field, there remains a UV boundary term

$$\mathcal{S} \propto \frac{1}{g_5^2} V_\mu(x, z) \partial_z V_\mu(x, z) \Big|_{z=l_0} + \mathcal{O}(V^3). \quad (24)$$

In applications to QCD, one fixed the UV boundary value of the field $V_\mu(x, l_0) \equiv v_\mu(x)$. $v_\mu(x)$ enjoys the properties of a source for the currents of the 4D global symmetry $\mathcal{G} \supset \text{SU}(N_f)_L \times \text{SU}(N_f)_R$. In that case, (24) is rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{g_5^2} v_\mu(x) \partial_z V_\mu(x, z) \Big|_{z=l_0}, \quad (25)$$

we can identify the symmetry currents of $\mathcal{G}$ ⁵

$$J_\mu = \frac{1}{g_5^2} \partial_z V_\mu|_{l_0} + \mathcal{O}(V^2). \quad (26)$$

Since one sets the sources equal to zero in order to extract Green's functions, the fields have Dirichlet (−) UV BCs in that case.

For applications to technicolor, one couples $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ gauge fields to the conserved currents of $\mathcal{G}$. In the holographic version, one promotes an $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ subgroup of $\mathcal{G}$ to be dynamical: the UV boundary values should be *independent* degrees of freedom. When decomposed in terms of KK modes, the boundary term (24) would then mix the new *dynamical* source with the resonances, analogously to $\rho - \gamma$ mixing in QCD. To diagonalize the action, the UV BCs should be changed from Dirichlet to Neumann

$$\partial_z V_\mu(x, z)|_{z=l_0} = 0, \quad (27)$$

for the $\text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)$ subgroup. The boundary term (24) then vanishes.

The procedure described above, of switching BCs to go from Holographic QCD to Holographic Technicolor, is valid irrespective of the metric. However, the change of BCs generally modifies the eigenmodes: only for gap metrics do the KK modes for the technicolor BCs keep a memory of the spectrum with QCD BCs.

To describe the change from (−) to (+) UV BCs one can use **SR1'** and **SR1''**. We define the gap (G) as the ratio of the sums Σ for these two cases

$$G = \frac{\Sigma_+^s}{\Sigma_-}. \quad (28)$$

⁵ This expression can be decomposed as a sum over KK modes: see [9] for a discussion.

Gap metrics satisfy

$$G \gg 1, \quad (29)$$

and the value of G is UV-dependent. For example, in AdS,

$$G = \log \left(\frac{l_1^2}{l_0^2} \right). \quad (30)$$

$G \gg 1$ signals the appearance of a new sector in the model: the *ultra-light* sector (UL). Whatever the metric, the sources acquire a mass as they become dynamical. The difference is that, in gap metrics, this mass is fed mainly to the UL sector, not the KKs. We will explain this point in detail in the next two subsections.

B. The gap as KK repellent

A gap metric is a metric which grows as $1/z$ or faster near the UV. In that case $\int w$ contains a parametrically large factor, which diverges for $l_0 \rightarrow 0$. This is going to impact the normalization of states, as well as the geometrical factors appearing in SRs, since these are integrals of w . For practical applications, we are interested in the limiting case of metrics that are approximately AdS near the UV, and our G -expansion will apply to that case for simplicity ⁶.

Following Section IV A, we now study the eigenmodes for (+) BCs on the UV brane. Consider removing the UV cut-off, i.e. $l_0 \rightarrow 0$. If a mode φ has to be normalizable

$$\int_0 w \varphi^2 < +\infty, \quad (31)$$

then it must satisfy

$$\varphi(0) = 0. \quad (32)$$

We recognize a (−) BC, even though we started out by asking that φ satisfy a (+) BC.

Next, we turn to what happens when $l_0 > 0$. The wave-function obtains corrections suppressed in the expansion in $1/G$. Indeed, one can show that the value of the field on the UV brane is suppressed

$$\varphi(l_0) = \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}) \ll \varphi(z \sim l_1) = \mathcal{O}(G^0). \quad (33)$$

⁶ The G -expansion can be performed for other gap metrics, but the order at which corrections appear would be different.

The mass of such modes is given in units of l_1 , the only remaining scale in the boundary value problem

$$M_{\text{KK}}^2 \propto \frac{1}{l_1^2}. \quad (34)$$

A bonus of this effect is the following: since these resonances do not distinguish Dirichlet from Neumann BCs in the UV, they are insensitive to the breaking happening there. In the case of Holographic Technicolor, where the UV breaking is of $\text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)_{B-L}$ to $\text{U}(1)_Y$, the spectrum of the KK modes is approximately isospin symmetric, i.e. the masses of the first two isospin components (in the W tower) are the same as the masses of the KKs of the third component (the excitations of the Z), up to $\mathcal{O}(1/G)$ corrections.

Summarizing, in gap metrics the KK sector satisfies approximately $(-)$ UV BCs.

C. Ultra-light modes in the generic case

Let's go back to the limit $l_0 \rightarrow 0$ and study the non-normalizable modes. Massless modes satisfy the following EOM

$$\partial(w\partial\alpha) = 0. \quad (35)$$

Solutions to this equation are

$$\partial\alpha \propto 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{w}. \quad (36)$$

For $(+, +)$ BCs, the solution is a flat mode, independently of the metric. For other BCs, the second solution in (36) is the right one. For example, for $(-, -)$ BCs, α is given by Equation (10). In Appendix B we give more details on the solution α for mixed IR BCs.

As Eq.(36) shows, α will satisfy $(+)$ UV BC in any metric where $w(z) \rightarrow \infty$ in the UV. In gap metrics, the mode is then flat near the UV ⁷. This is important: when $l_0 > 0$, the norm of its kinetic term will still be large (compared to its mass term). To get to a canonical normalization, the wave-function has to be rescaled to

$$\varphi_{\text{UL}} = \mathcal{O}(G^{-1/2}). \quad (37)$$

⁷ In flat space, it would be a linearly decreasing mode. In deconstructed spaces, this is the breathing mode with an enhanced contribution on the site corresponding to the UV brane (which has a smaller gauge coupling). We thank Andy Cohen, Shelly Glashow, Thomas Grégoire and Claudio Rebbi for a discussion of this point.

Because of this, such modes remain light compared to the KKs,

$$\frac{M_{\text{UL}}^2}{M_{\text{KK}}^2} = \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}) \ll 1. \quad (38)$$

This justifies our notation UL for ultra-light modes, which are kept apart from the rest of the KK tower.

D. The particular case of EWSB

In models of EWSB, the ultra-light modes are identified with the W and Z (and γ). Starting with a bulk gauge group $\text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$, one breaks it to the electroweak by BCs *à la Higgsless* [2, 19, 20, 21, 22] taking into account the effect of bulk breaking, as described in [11, 23].

Rather than L and R fields, we work with V and A combinations, which diagonalize the IR BCs

$$A|_{l_1} = 0, \quad (39)$$

$$\partial V|_{l_1} = 0, \quad (40)$$

$$\partial B|_{l_1} = 0. \quad (41)$$

At the other end, the UV BCs are

$$V^\pm + A^\pm|_{l_0} = 0, \quad (42)$$

$$\partial (V^\pm - A^\pm)|_{l_0} = 0, \quad (43)$$

for the first two isospin components. For the third isospin component, one imposes

$$V^0 + A^0 - B|_{l_0} = 0, \quad (44)$$

$$\partial (V^0 - A^0)|_{l_0} = 0, \quad (45)$$

$$\partial \left(V^0 + A^0 + \frac{\tilde{g}_5^2}{g_5^2} B \right) |_{l_0} = 0. \quad (46)$$

We will thus expand a generic wave-function in terms of its A and V components (and a B component for the neutral modes). Let us define the eigen-functions satisfying the appropriate BCs as two/three-component vectors for the charged/neutral vector bosons

$$|\Psi_{X^\pm}\rangle = |A_{X^\pm}, V_{X^\pm}\rangle, \quad (47)$$

$$|\Psi_{X^0}\rangle = |A_{X^0}, V_{X^0}, B_{X^0}\rangle. \quad (48)$$

Then the norm will be given by,

$$\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle \equiv 2 \int \left(\frac{w_A}{g_5^2} A^2 + \frac{w_V}{g_5^2} V^2 + \frac{w_B}{2\tilde{g}_5^2} B^2 \right). \quad (49)$$

1. the KK sector

We saw in Section IV B that, at order G^0 , the KK sector is given by solutions with $(-)$ UV BCs. At this order, one can thus classify the KKs into modes that are mainly vector or mainly axial. Indeed, for the charged sector, we have a subset of modes with a large vector component and a small axial one

$$|\Psi_{V_n^\pm}\rangle = |0, \varphi_{+,n}\rangle + \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}), \quad (50)$$

and vice-versa

$$|\Psi_{A_n^\pm}\rangle = |\varphi_{-,n}, 0\rangle + \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}). \quad (51)$$

In both cases, the leading-order component is the $\varphi_{+,n}$ or $\varphi_{-,n}$ obtained with the $(-)$ UV BC. Note that both components are only of order G^{-1} in l_0 and the two components are comparable and satisfy the UV BC: $V + A|_{l_0} = 0$.

Since the spectrum of heavy modes goes through from the case with $(-)$ UV BCs, we can deduce the following approximate sum rule

$$\Sigma_W^{\text{KK}} \equiv \sum_{X=V,A;n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{M_{X_n^\pm}^2} = \Sigma_+ + \Sigma_- + \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}), \quad (52)$$

where $\Sigma_{+,-}$ are given in (8-9).

The same method can be applied for the neutral KKs, where the modes split into three towers

$$|\Psi_{V_n^0}\rangle = |0, \varphi_{+,n}, 0\rangle + \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}), \quad (53)$$

$$|\Psi_{A_n^0}\rangle = |\varphi_{-,n}, 0, 0\rangle + \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}), \quad (54)$$

$$|\Psi_{B_n^0}\rangle = |0, 0, \varphi_{+,n}\rangle + \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}). \quad (55)$$

The sum of all the inverse of the masses is given by

$$\Sigma_{Z,\gamma}^{\text{KK}} \equiv \sum_{X=V,A,B;n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{M_{X_n^0}^2} = 2\Sigma_+ + \Sigma_- + \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}), \quad (56)$$

where we have assumed for simplicity $w_B = w_V$.

2. The ultra-light modes and their masses

Here we illustrate the use of sum rules to extract the mass of the W in an expansion in $1/G$. The advantage of the method is again that it will work whatever the metric, without having to solve numerically the boundary value problem.

Out of the ultra-light modes described in the general case in Section IV C, we can construct combinations that satisfy the UV BCs for the EWSB case. This yields the wavefunctions of the W, Z and γ . We get, at order $\mathcal{O}(G^{-1/2})$

$$|W\rangle \simeq \sqrt{\frac{g_5^2}{2Gl_0}} |\alpha_-, -1\rangle, \quad (57)$$

$$|Z\rangle \simeq \sqrt{\frac{g_5^2}{2Gl_0}} \sqrt{\frac{g_5^2 + 2\tilde{g}_5^2}{g_5^2 + \tilde{g}_5^2}} \left| \alpha_-, -\frac{g_5^2}{g_5^2 + 2\tilde{g}_5^2}, \frac{2\tilde{g}_5^2}{g_5^2 + 2\tilde{g}_5^2} \right\rangle, \quad (58)$$

$$|\gamma\rangle \simeq \sqrt{\frac{g_5^2}{2Gl_0}} |0, 1, 1\rangle, \quad (59)$$

where α_- is given by (10).

We now want to extract the masses of these modes for a completely generic metric. We know that the UL modes are much lighter than the other KKs. Using the same techniques as before, we can derive a sum rule to express the sum including the UL mode

$$\Sigma_W \equiv \frac{1}{M_W^2} + \Sigma_W^{\text{KK}}, \quad (60)$$

in terms of a geometrical factor. This sum will be dominated by the UL mode. Similarly to **SR1**, one can derive this SR by taking into account the difference in BCs (39-43). The result is

$$\Sigma_W = \int w_A \int_z \frac{1}{w_A} + \int w_V \int \frac{1}{w_A} + \int w_V \int^z \frac{1}{w_V}. \quad (61)$$

In gap metrics, Σ_W diverges as $l_0 \rightarrow 0$ due to the presence of the UL sector.

Using Equation (52), one obtains that Σ_W is also equal to $1/M_W^2$ at order G^{-1} ,

$$M_W^2 = \frac{1}{\Sigma_W} + \mathcal{O}(G^{-2}). \quad (62)$$

We can go one step further in the approximation, since we know the contribution from the other (heavy) KK modes at order G^0 (52). We can thus write

$$M_W^2 = \frac{1}{\Sigma_W - \Sigma_+ - \Sigma_-} + \mathcal{O}(G^{-3}). \quad (63)$$

E. Holographically turning QCD into Technicolor

In the above, we have looked into the procedure of allowing the UV boundary fields to be dynamical. We found an important difference between flat space and gap metrics. In flat space, the sources would couple to *all* the resonances. Therefore, when the boundary gauge fields are turned on, the whole spectrum is changed. This can be contrasted with the case of gap metrics:

- In gap metrics, the KKs are repelled from the UV brane. KKs with (+) UV BCs approximately also satisfy (−) UV BCs. In gap metrics, their wave-functions and masses are changed only by $1/G$ corrections
- Because of this, the KKs become approximately *blind* to the UV, and separate into modes that are essentially V or essentially A , with a smaller admixture of the other. For the neutral component, there are also B modes.
- Since isospin breaking is located on the UV brane, the KKs are approximately blind to it. V & A resonances are thus isospin symmetric at leading order.
- The modes that were non-normalizable in the limit $G \rightarrow \infty$ are now normalizable, but ultra-light. At leading order in G , the wave-function of the axial UL mode is proportional to the would-be Goldstones. These UL modes feel the UV BCs, and should be combined together in order to yield the physical W and Z .

V. RHO AND T PARAMETERS

The models we consider here belong to the general class of models with “universal corrections”, as defined in [24, 25]. This class encompasses the case of oblique corrections, but is more general⁸. In addition to the oblique corrections to W and Z interactions, such models also exhibit non-oblique corrections involving the KK modes only.

A good example is the following: non-oblique (but universal) corrections entail making

⁸ For a good illustration in the related case of a deconstructed extra-dimension, see [7].

a distinction between the rho parameter ⁹ and the T parameter ¹⁰. In the low-energy limit, the exchange of KK resonances generate other local four-fermion terms in addition to the ones due to the exchange of W and Z . The KK-modes contribute to $\rho_*(0)$, but *not* to T . Thus $\rho_*(0) \neq 1 + \alpha T$.

In this section we obtain a SR showing that custodial symmetry in the bulk ensures

$$\rho_*(0) = 1, \quad (64)$$

for *any* metric. The whole tower contributes to the SR to ensure this equality. In addition, for gap metrics, one can also quantify the degree of suppression of the T parameter,

$$\alpha T = \mathcal{O}(G^{-3}). \quad (65)$$

A. The Fermi constant

The expression of the Fermi constant in this class of models is given by

$$G_F \equiv \sqrt{2} \sum_{X=V,A;n=W}^{\infty} \frac{A_{X_n^\pm}(l_0)^2}{(M_{X_n^\pm})^2}, \quad (66)$$

with the sum running over the W and its KKs, $n = W, 1, \dots, \infty$ and where $A_{X_n^\pm}$ is the axial component of $|\Psi_{X_n^\pm}\rangle$. This is an example of the sums considered in (13), this time with UV BCs that mix V & A fields. One must again express $A(z)/M^2$ as a double integral by integrating twice the EOM,

$$\frac{A_{X_n^\pm}(z)}{M_{X_n^\pm}^2} = \int_z \frac{1}{w_A} \left(\int^{z'} w_A A_{X_n^\pm} - \int w_V V_{X_n^\pm} \right). \quad (67)$$

With this, we obtain

$$G_F = \sqrt{2} \sum_{X=V,A;n=W}^{\infty} A_{X_n^\pm}(l_0) \int \frac{1}{w_A} \int^z w_A A_{X_n^\pm}, \quad (68)$$

where the second term in (67) vanishes when inserted into (66). Finally, using the completeness relation we get

$$G_F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}g_5^2} \int \frac{1}{w_A}. \quad (69)$$

⁹ $\rho_*(0)$ is the ratio of neutrino interactions via neutral currents with respect to those occurring via charged currents.

¹⁰ T only compares W and Z interactions.

From Equation (19), we can rewrite the result in terms of the decay constant of the would-be Goldstones that are eaten

$$G_F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}f^2}. \quad (70)$$

This is an exact relation obtained through SRs and shows that the would-be Goldstones are not eaten solely by the W mode, but are also fed partly to the KKs. This result is very intuitive but, from the 4D perspective, Equation (70) could be verified only after taking into account *all* KK contributions.

B. The rho parameter

The low-energy rho parameter in this class of models reads

$$\rho_*(0) \equiv \sqrt{2} \sum_{X=V,A,B;n=Z}^{\infty} \frac{A_{X_n^0}(l_0)^2}{M_{X_n^0}^2} \Big/ G_F, \quad (71)$$

where the sum includes the Z and all neutral KK modes. Due to the custodial symmetry, the expression for A/M^2 (67) is still valid for the neutral fields¹¹. From there on, the derivation goes through from the charged to the neutral case, *mutatis mutandi*¹²

$$\sum_{X=V,A,B;n=Z}^{\infty} \frac{A_{X_n^0}(l_0)^2}{M_{X_n^0}^2} = \sum_{X=V,A,B;n=Z}^{\infty} A_{X_n^0}(l_0) \int \frac{1}{w_A} \int^z w_A A_{X_n^0} \quad (72)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2f^2}, \quad (73)$$

and thus

$$\rho_*(0) = 1, \quad (74)$$

independently of the geometry $w_V(z), w_A(z)$. The only requirement to obtain $\rho_*(0) = 1$ is the bulk $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ symmetry. This is again a good example of how 5D symmetries show up in 4D observables by (not) summing over the whole tower of KKs.

For the case of bulk fermions, the expression (71) would then involve the square of the overlap integrals of the fermions with A . The same modification occurs for the W tower as for the Z tower, leading again to (74).

¹¹ Note that this is only true for the axial component.

¹² The massless photon can be omitted in the application of the completeness relation, since it has no axial component.

C. The T parameter

The T parameter, defined through

$$1 + \alpha T = \frac{A_Z(l_0)^2}{M_Z^2} \bigg/ \frac{A_W(l_0)^2}{M_W^2}, \quad (75)$$

only involves two eigenmodes, the W and Z . T can be calculated by subtracting the contributions of KK modes from the total sums of Section V A, writing

$$\frac{A_W(l_0)^2}{M_W^2} = \frac{1}{2f^2} - \sum_{X=V,A;n=1}^{\infty} \frac{A_{X_n^\pm}(l_0)^2}{M_{X_n^\pm}^2}, \quad (76)$$

$$\frac{A_Z(l_0)^2}{M_Z^2} = \frac{1}{2f^2} - \sum_{X=V,A,B;n=1}^{\infty} \frac{A_{X_n^0}(l_0)^2}{M_{X_n^0}^2}. \quad (77)$$

In gap metrics, the KK contributions are suppressed with respect to those of the UL because

- the KKs masses are enhanced with respect to that of W and Z

$$\frac{M_{W,Z}^2}{M_{\text{KK}}^2} = \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}), \quad (78)$$

- the KK wave-functions are repelled from the brane, whereas those of the UL modes are not

$$\frac{A_{\text{KK}}(l_0)^2}{A_{W,Z}(l_0)^2} = \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}), \quad (79)$$

- the KK masses and wave-functions are approximately isospin symmetric

$$M_{X_n^0}^2 / M_{X_n^\pm}^2 = 1 + \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}), \quad (80)$$

$$A_{X_n^0}^2(l_0) / A_{X_n^\pm}^2(l_0) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(G^{-1}), \quad (81)$$

$$A_{B_n}^2(l_0) = 0 + \mathcal{O}(G^{-3}), \quad (82)$$

where $X = V, A$. The last two results can be established using equation (67). Since each factor introduces a suppression by $1/G$, we get

$$\alpha T = \mathcal{O}(G^{-3}). \quad (83)$$

VI. CONCLUSIONS

What distinguishes a 5D model from a 4D model of resonances? An effective description of a 5D model inherits interesting properties from its extra-dimensional nature. In other words, *all* the KKs *cooperate* together to preserve 5D symmetries and a soft behavior at high energies.

To see this characteristic behavior one needs a method to shortcut the —impossible— task of summing over an infinite number of KKs. In this paper we have presented such a shortcut that follows the ideas of holography.

One advantage of this method is that infinite sums over KKs are converted into *geometrical factors*: integrals involving just the metric, and not the individual KK properties. These geometrical factors lead to analytic expressions for physical observables.

Using this method, properties that depend on the 5D nature of the model (non-locality, 5D symmetries) are automatically verified, *independently* of the particular metric considered in the model. Another use of the method is to classify 5D models (metrics) in terms of their approximate behavior. In this paper, we identify a subclass of metrics, *gap metrics*, suitable to be a good description for electroweak symmetry breaking.

Finally, the most interesting physical quantities are quadratic. Even in the presence of background fields, our method is valid to obtain quadratic observables like the S, T or ρ_* . This is possible thanks to the rewriting of these background fields as effective metrics [18].

Acknowledgments

J.H. is supported by DOE grant DE-FG02-92ER40704 and V.S. by grant DE-FG02-91ER40676.

APPENDIX A: NOTATIONS

We will use the following shorthand notation

$$\int_{l_0}^{l_1} dz f(z) \equiv \int f, \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\int_{l_0}^z dz' f(z') \equiv \int^z f, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\int_z^{l_1} dz' f(z') \equiv \int_z f, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where we omit the integration variables and the limits if they lie on the interval endpoints (l_0, l_1) . Double integrals are denoted as follows,

$$\int_{l_0}^z f(z') dz' \int_{l_0}^{z'} g(z'') dz'' = \int^z f \int^{z'} g. \quad (\text{A4})$$

APPENDIX B: MIXED IR BC

In most of the paper, we present results for $(+)$ or $(-)$ IR BCs. The case of mixed BC can also be treated in the same manner, and we give an example here. This is particularly relevant since the effect of a coupling to a bulk scalar obtaining a vev (15) also effectively yields a mixed BC, as shown in [18].

As an example, we compute the sum $\sum 1/M_n^2$ for the case with mixed IR BC (and $(-)$ UV BC). We first point out that the EOM can always be rewritten as

$$-\frac{1}{w\alpha_\kappa^2} \partial \left(w\alpha_\kappa^2 \partial \frac{\varphi_\kappa}{\alpha_\kappa} \right) = M^2 \frac{\varphi_\kappa}{\alpha_\kappa}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where w is the effective metric for the modes in question, and φ_κ satisfies the IR BC

$$\partial (\log \varphi_\kappa)|_{l_1} = -\kappa. \quad (\text{B2})$$

$\kappa = 0, \infty$ corresponds to $(+)$ and $(-)$ IR BCs. Anything in between corresponds to mixed BCs.

To make sense of (B1), we have to recall the definition of the auxiliary function α . It is defined to satisfy a massless equation

$$\partial (w\partial\alpha_\kappa) = 0, \quad (\text{B3})$$

and the same IR BC as φ_κ , i.e.

$$\partial(\log \alpha_\kappa)|_{l_1} = -\kappa, \quad (\text{B4})$$

but normalized to one on the UV brane

$$\alpha_\kappa|_{l_0} = 1. \quad (\text{B5})$$

As shown in [18], the function α_κ can be determined explicitly as

$$\alpha_\kappa = \frac{\frac{1}{\kappa w(l_1)} + \int_z \frac{1}{w}}{\frac{1}{\kappa w(l_1)} + \int \frac{1}{w}}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

There are then two cases: (+) and mixed IR BCs on one side, which can be rewritten as

$$\partial\left(\frac{\varphi}{\alpha}\right)\Big|_{l_1} = 0, \quad (\text{B7})$$

and (−) IR BC, for which

$$\alpha|_{l_1} = \varphi|_{l_1} = 0. \quad (\text{B8})$$

For the first case (B7), one can directly apply the technique of Section II on the function φ/α , since it obeys a standard EOM with effective metric $w\alpha^2$, and with (−, +) BCs. This yields

$$\text{for } \kappa < \infty, \quad \frac{\varphi_{\kappa,n}}{M_{\kappa,n}^2} = \alpha_\kappa \int \frac{1}{w\alpha_\kappa^2} \int_{z'} w\alpha_\kappa \varphi_{\kappa,n}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

This implies

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{M_{\kappa,n}^2} = \int w\alpha_\kappa^2 \int^z \frac{1}{w\alpha_\kappa^2}. \quad (\text{B10})$$

Note that this reproduces (8) for $\kappa = 0$, in which case $\alpha_0 = 1$. For the (−, −) case, one pays attention to the boundary terms when integrating the EOM twice. This yields

$$\frac{\varphi_{-,n}}{M_{-,n}^2} = (\alpha_- - 1) \int \frac{1}{w} \int_{z'} w\varphi_{-,n} + \int^z \frac{1}{w} \int_{z'} w\varphi_{-,n}, \quad (\text{B11})$$

and thus

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{M_{-,n}^2} = \int w\alpha_- \int^z \frac{1}{w}, \quad (\text{B12})$$

as promised in (9).

[1] D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 065020 (2004), hep-ph/0304182.

- [2] C. Csaki, C. Grojean, H. Murayama, L. Pilo, and J. Terning, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 055006 (2004), hep-ph/0305237.
- [3] R. Sekhar Chivukula, D. A. Dicus, and H.-J. He, Phys. Lett. **B525**, 175 (2002), hep-ph/0111016.
- [4] R. S. Chivukula and H.-J. He, Phys. Lett. **B532**, 121 (2002), hep-ph/0201164.
- [5] J. Hirn and J. Stern, Eur. Phys. J. **C34**, 447 (2004), hep-ph/0401032.
- [6] R. S. Chivukula, M. Kurachi, and M. Tanabashi, JHEP **06**, 004 (2004), hep-ph/0403112.
- [7] R. S. Chivukula, E. H. Simmons, H.-J. He, M. Kurachi, and M. Tanabashi, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 075008 (2004), hep-ph/0406077.
- [8] H. Georgi, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 015016 (2005), hep-ph/0408067.
- [9] J. Hirn and V. Sanz, JHEP **12**, 030 (2005), hep-ph/0507049.
- [10] T. Sakai and S. Sugimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **114**, 1083 (2006), hep-th/0507073.
- [11] J. Hirn and V. Sanz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 121803 (2006), hep-ph/0606086.
- [12] R. Sekhar Chivukula, E. H. Simmons, H.-J. He, M. Kurachi, and M. Tanabashi (2006), hep-ph/0612070.
- [13] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999), hep-ph/9905221.
- [14] A. Karch, E. Katz, D. T. Son, and M. A. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 015005 (2006), hep-ph/0602229.
- [15] J. Erlich, E. Katz, D. T. Son, and M. A. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 261602 (2005), hep-ph/0501128.
- [16] L. Da Rold and A. Pomarol, Nucl. Phys. **B721**, 79 (2005), hep-ph/0501218.
- [17] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri, and Y. Oz, Phys. Rept. **323**, 183 (2000), hep-th/9905111.
- [18] J. Hirn and V. Sanz (2006), hep-ph/0612239.
- [19] K. Agashe, A. Delgado, M. J. May, and R. Sundrum, JHEP **08**, 050 (2003), hep-ph/0308036.
- [20] C. Csaki, C. Grojean, L. Pilo, and J. Terning, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 101802 (2004), hep-ph/0308038.
- [21] G. Cacciapaglia, C. Csaki, C. Grojean, and J. Terning, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 075014 (2004), hep-ph/0401160.
- [22] G. Cacciapaglia, C. Csaki, C. Grojean, and J. Terning, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 035015 (2005), hep-ph/0409126.

- [23] J. Hirn, N. Rius, and V. Sanz, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 085005 (2006), hep-ph/0512240.
- [24] R. Barbieri, A. Pomarol, R. Rattazzi, and A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. **B703**, 127 (2004), hep-ph/0405040.
- [25] G. Cacciapaglia, C. Csaki, G. Marandella, and A. Strumia, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 033011 (2006), hep-ph/0604111.